

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 20 and 21 have been amended and new Claims 22-25 are submitted for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the instant application.

Applicants believe that the above amendments to Claim 1 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections and rejections.

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-12, 15-16 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Maurer et al (U.S.P.N. 3,444,007), is respectfully traversed.

Maurer employs a process that includes chromates (i.e., a chromate rinse) and, therefore, produces a product containing chromates. In contrast, the rejected claims recite a process that is substantially free of chromates. Maurer, therefore, does not disclose each and every aspect of the claims and cannot anticipate the claimed invention.

The rejection of Claims 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakatsugawa (U.S.P.N. 4,386,139), is respectfully traversed.

Nakatsugawa is limited to treating a copper foil and, therefore, cannot anticipate each and every aspect of Claims 20 and 21. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The rejection of Claims 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurer et al., is respectfully traversed.

Maurer et al. have the aforementioned deficiencies. Col. 3, Lines 1-3 of Maurer indicate that there is "...no particular advantage gained from large quantities of the metal ions...". The examples of Maurer use relatively low quantities of metal ions. In light of the teaching that there is no advantage to using large quantities and that lower quantities are actually used, a skilled person in this art would not find it "obvious to try" the claimed amounts. Applicants respectfully submit that Maurer is insufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and, therefore, request withdrawal of this rejection.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 15, 17, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Hanagata et al. (U.S.P.N. 5,057,335), is respectfully traversed.

Hanagata does not disclose a rinsing step after removal from the claimed medium. Hanagata cannot disclose each and every aspect of the claimed invention and, therefore, fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against the rejected claims.

The rejection of Claims 10, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata et al. in view of Nakatsugawa, is respectfully traversed.

Hanagata and Nakatsugawa are non-analogous art. Hanagata relates to using a laser to form a ceramic coating upon metal surface whereas Nakatsugawa relates to electroplating to form a printed circuit. A skilled person in these respective arts would not consider laser irradiation as being related to electroplating. Accordingly, these non-analogous references cannot be properly combined to render the claimed invention obvious.

Applicants believe that the claimed invention defines patentable subject matter and request issuance of a Notice of Allowability. Please find attached hereto a Three Month Extension of Time. Should there be any other fee due in connection with this Response, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 15-0689 (Orscheln Management Co.). Should the Examiner deem that any further action on the part of Applicant would be desirable, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael K. Boyer  
Attorney for Applicants  
U.S. Patent Off Reg No 33,085  
Tel: 660 269-4536  
Fax: 660 269-4530  
Email: mboyer@orscheln.com

Encl.: Three Month Extension of Time  
Certificate of Facsimile Transmission Dated: November 04, 2005